

## PROCEEDINGS IN CONGRESS.

## The Naval Appropriation Bill Passed By the House—The Consular and Diplomatic Bill.

## THE FORTY-EIGHTH CONGRESS.

The House.  
WASHINGTON, D. C., Jan. 10.—Immediately after the reading of the journal, Mr. Randall moved to dispense with the morning hour, for the purpose of pressing the navy appropriation bill to passage.

This was strongly opposed by Mr. Stocklagger, who maintained that the House should proceed with the consideration of the special order in reference to public buildings.

Mr. Randall pointed out the importance of passing appropriation bills speedily. Not to do so would be to risk an extra session, which would be of little good to the country and still less to the party to which he belonged.

Mr. Stocklagger replied with some warmth that he was performing what he considered his duty in contending for consideration of the special order.

Quite a brisk and apparently personal colloquy then sprang up between Randall and Stocklagger, but the confusion in the hall was so great as to render their remarks unintelligible.

Mr. Stocklagger demanded the yeas and nays on Mr. Randall's motion, which was lost—yeas, 133; nays, 89—the necessary two-thirds not voting in the affirmative.

Mr. Stocklagger then moved that the House go into Committee of the Whole for the consideration of public building measures, and asked consent to make a statement.

Mr. Hutchins objected. The Navy Department was without appropriations, and it was time that the House should proceed to business.

Mr. Stocklagger's motion was lost—72 to 9—and the Speaker proceeded to call committees for reports.

Mr. Clardy, from the Committee on Commerce, reported a bill authorizing experiments as to the practicability of lighting the navigable waters of the United States by electricity. Referred to Committee of the Whole.

A bill was reported from the Committee on Public Buildings increasing to \$180,000 the limit of the appropriation for a public building at Marquette, Mich.

The House then went into Committee of the Whole, Mr. Walborn in the chair, on the Naval Appropriation bill for the remainder of the current year.

The following is the report of the Committee on Appropriations in explanation of the bill:

The bill makes provision for naval service for the six months ending June 30, 1885, on the basis of the bill which passed the House at the first session of this Congress, giving for each item of expenditure just one-half the amount contained in said bill, with the following exceptions: For current expenses of the bureau, yards and docks, in lieu of one-half, or \$100,000, there is given \$200,000; for current expenses of the Bureau of Construction and Repair, in lieu of one-half, or \$500,000, there is given \$450,000; for current expenses of the Bureau of Steam Engineering, in lieu of one-half, or \$375,000, there is given \$380,000; together with the unexpended balance of \$140,000 from the appropriation in 1884 for monitors; for pay of the navy and marine corps there is given in lieu of one-half of the amount contained in said bill, a sum equal to the balance remaining after deducting appropriations for the first six months from the whole sum proposed in said bill. There is nothing in the bill for steel cruisers, the appropriation to complete them having already been made. The bill appropriates in all \$5,120,155, which added to the sum appropriated for the first six months ended December 31, 1884, \$8,860,317, makes the total appropriations for the navy for the entire fiscal year of 1885, \$14,980,472, or \$913,961 less than was appropriated for the fiscal year 1884.

There was no general debate on the bill, and it was immediately read by sections for amendment.

On a point of order, raised by Mr. Glasscock, the provision that naval line officers may be detailed as instructors in any schools or colleges was struck from the bill.

No amendments were offered, and the committee having risen, the bill passed without a dissenting vote.

The House then went into Committee of the Whole, Mr. Wilson, of Iowa, in the chair, on the Consular and Diplomatic Appropriation bill.

Mr. Burnes stated that the appropriation carried by the bill was \$1,130,884, or \$132,221 less than the estimates. An item of \$290,000, asked for by the estimates for re-surveying the boundary line between the United States and Mexico, was omitted. Many things remained undone that under the treaty with Mexico must be done before that Government would be bound to pay one-half of the expense of the work.

Mr. Townshend, in his remarks upon the consular service, attributed the present business depression to overproduction, and favored opening up the markets of Southern nations to the surplus production of this country. These remarks could be secured by the formation of a national alliance with those nations, which would give the manufacturers of the United States an advantage over the manufacturers of Europe. From the similarity of their institutions to those of the United States, if they could be disabused of the idea that the United States wanted to conquer their political sovereignty, the countries of Central and South America would join with us in seeking to build up the welfare of the American Continent and develop its resources.

Mr. Robinson, of New York, said the pending measure was one to enable Americans abroad to make fools of themselves and forget their Americanism. He was opposed to the appropriation of money to pamper incurable snobs. There was no use for American Ministers abroad except to degrade their Government. He did not want a Democratic snob to succeed the Republican snob, Lowell. Let Dr. Burchard be appointed to succeed Lowell. He was a man to express ideas and a fair representative of Democratic Americanism. The wonderful speech of Dr. Burchard had not turned a single vote from Blaine to Cleveland. In the course of his Congressional career he had said many things which had been called foolish by the snobs and dukes that run the American press. But all his actions had been prompted by love for American institutions. It would always be his pride and pleasure to be able to state to his children and his children's children that while a member of the House he had stood up for American principles against the contaminating influences of a foreign aristocracy.

Mr. Chase said as long as a rule of poverty pay to American ministers and consuls continued there would be poor service.

After further arguments, debate closed, and the bill was read by sections for amendments.

Mr. Holman raised the point of order

against the item providing for a Consul General at Madrid.

The point was sustained and it was stricken out.

The committee rose and the House adjourned.

FROM THE SUNDAY SENTINEL.

## THE INDIAN LEASES.

## The Cherokee Lease Investigation—The Lease Evidently Secured Through Bribery.

WASHINGTON, Jan. 10.—Colonel Boudinot, of the Cherokee Nation, was examined by the Senate Committee on Indian Affairs regarding the leasing of Indian lands to-day. He had no personal knowledge of any bribery or irregularity in connection with the leasing. He had heard a rumor that \$4,000 was paid C. W. Rogers, a member of the Cherokee Council, to secure a lease.

He declined to give the name of the person who told him, as he was only hearsay with his informant. He would not give the name of the person who told him, as he was only hearsay with his informant. He would not give the name of the person who told him, as he was only hearsay with his informant.

He declined to give the name of the person who told him, as he was only hearsay with his informant. He would not give the name of the person who told him, as he was only hearsay with his informant.

He declined to give the name of the person who told him, as he was only hearsay with his informant. He would not give the name of the person who told him, as he was only hearsay with his informant.

He declined to give the name of the person who told him, as he was only hearsay with his informant. He would not give the name of the person who told him, as he was only hearsay with his informant.

He declined to give the name of the person who told him, as he was only hearsay with his informant. He would not give the name of the person who told him, as he was only hearsay with his informant.

He declined to give the name of the person who told him, as he was only hearsay with his informant. He would not give the name of the person who told him, as he was only hearsay with his informant.

He declined to give the name of the person who told him, as he was only hearsay with his informant. He would not give the name of the person who told him, as he was only hearsay with his informant.

He declined to give the name of the person who told him, as he was only hearsay with his informant. He would not give the name of the person who told him, as he was only hearsay with his informant.

He declined to give the name of the person who told him, as he was only hearsay with his informant. He would not give the name of the person who told him, as he was only hearsay with his informant.

He declined to give the name of the person who told him, as he was only hearsay with his informant. He would not give the name of the person who told him, as he was only hearsay with his informant.

He declined to give the name of the person who told him, as he was only hearsay with his informant. He would not give the name of the person who told him, as he was only hearsay with his informant.

He declined to give the name of the person who told him, as he was only hearsay with his informant. He would not give the name of the person who told him, as he was only hearsay with his informant.

He declined to give the name of the person who told him, as he was only hearsay with his informant. He would not give the name of the person who told him, as he was only hearsay with his informant.

He declined to give the name of the person who told him, as he was only hearsay with his informant. He would not give the name of the person who told him, as he was only hearsay with his informant.

He declined to give the name of the person who told him, as he was only hearsay with his informant. He would not give the name of the person who told him, as he was only hearsay with his informant.

He declined to give the name of the person who told him, as he was only hearsay with his informant. He would not give the name of the person who told him, as he was only hearsay with his informant.

He declined to give the name of the person who told him, as he was only hearsay with his informant. He would not give the name of the person who told him, as he was only hearsay with his informant.

He declined to give the name of the person who told him, as he was only hearsay with his informant. He would not give the name of the person who told him, as he was only hearsay with his informant.

He declined to give the name of the person who told him, as he was only hearsay with his informant. He would not give the name of the person who told him, as he was only hearsay with his informant.

He declined to give the name of the person who told him, as he was only hearsay with his informant. He would not give the name of the person who told him, as he was only hearsay with his informant.

He declined to give the name of the person who told him, as he was only hearsay with his informant. He would not give the name of the person who told him, as he was only hearsay with his informant.

He declined to give the name of the person who told him, as he was only hearsay with his informant. He would not give the name of the person who told him, as he was only hearsay with his informant.

He declined to give the name of the person who told him, as he was only hearsay with his informant. He would not give the name of the person who told him, as he was only hearsay with his informant.

He declined to give the name of the person who told him, as he was only hearsay with his informant. He would not give the name of the person who told him, as he was only hearsay with his informant.

He declined to give the name of the person who told him, as he was only hearsay with his informant. He would not give the name of the person who told him, as he was only hearsay with his informant.

He declined to give the name of the person who told him, as he was only hearsay with his informant. He would not give the name of the person who told him, as he was only hearsay with his informant.

He declined to give the name of the person who told him, as he was only hearsay with his informant. He would not give the name of the person who told him, as he was only hearsay with his informant.

He declined to give the name of the person who told him, as he was only hearsay with his informant. He would not give the name of the person who told him, as he was only hearsay with his informant.

He declined to give the name of the person who told him, as he was only hearsay with his informant. He would not give the name of the person who told him, as he was only hearsay with his informant.

He declined to give the name of the person who told him, as he was only hearsay with his informant. He would not give the name of the person who told him, as he was only hearsay with his informant.

He declined to give the name of the person who told him, as he was only hearsay with his informant. He would not give the name of the person who told him, as he was only hearsay with his informant.

He declined to give the name of the person who told him, as he was only hearsay with his informant. He would not give the name of the person who told him, as he was only hearsay with his informant.

He declined to give the name of the person who told him, as he was only hearsay with his informant. He would not give the name of the person who told him, as he was only hearsay with his informant.

He declined to give the name of the person who told him, as he was only hearsay with his informant. He would not give the name of the person who told him, as he was only hearsay with his informant.

He declined to give the name of the person who told him, as he was only hearsay with his informant. He would not give the name of the person who told him, as he was only hearsay with his informant.

He declined to give the name of the person who told him, as he was only hearsay with his informant. He would not give the name of the person who told him, as he was only hearsay with his informant.

He declined to give the name of the person who told him, as he was only hearsay with his informant. He would not give the name of the person who told him, as he was only hearsay with his informant.

He declined to give the name of the person who told him, as he was only hearsay with his informant. He would not give the name of the person who told him, as he was only hearsay with his informant.

He declined to give the name of the person who told him, as he was only hearsay with his informant. He would not give the name of the person who told him, as he was only hearsay with his informant.

He declined to give the name of the person who told him, as he was only hearsay with his informant. He would not give the name of the person who told him, as he was only hearsay with his informant.

He declined to give the name of the person who told him, as he was only hearsay with his informant. He would not give the name of the person who told him, as he was only hearsay with his informant.

He declined to give the name of the person who told him, as he was only hearsay with his informant. He would not give the name of the person who told him, as he was only hearsay with his informant.

He declined to give the name of the person who told him, as he was only hearsay with his informant. He would not give the name of the person who told him, as he was only hearsay with his informant.

against the item providing for a Consul General at Madrid.

The point was sustained and it was stricken out.

The committee rose and the House adjourned.

FROM THE SUNDAY SENTINEL.

## THE INDIAN LEASES.

## The Cherokee Lease Investigation—The Lease Evidently Secured Through Bribery.

WASHINGTON, Jan. 10.—Colonel Boudinot, of the Cherokee Nation, was examined by the Senate Committee on Indian Affairs regarding the leasing of Indian lands to-day. He had no personal knowledge of any bribery or irregularity in connection with the leasing. He had heard a rumor that \$4,000 was paid C. W. Rogers, a member of the Cherokee Council, to secure a lease.

He declined to give the name of the person who told him, as he was only hearsay with his informant. He would not give the name of the person who told him, as he was only hearsay with his informant.

He declined to give the name of the person who told him, as he was only hearsay with his informant. He would not give the name of the person who told him, as he was only hearsay with his informant.

He declined to give the name of the person who told him, as he was only hearsay with his informant. He would not give the name of the person who told him, as he was only hearsay with his informant.

He declined to give the name of the person who told him, as he was only hearsay with his informant. He would not give the name of the person who told him, as he was only hearsay with his informant.

He declined to give the name of the person who told him, as he was only hearsay with his informant. He would not give the name of the person who told him, as he was only hearsay with his informant.

He declined to give the name of the person who told him, as he was only hearsay with his informant. He would not give the name of the person who told him, as he was only hearsay with his informant.

He declined to give the name of the person who told him, as he was only hearsay with his informant. He would not give the name of the person who told him, as he was only hearsay with his informant.

He declined to give the name of the person who told him, as he was only hearsay with his informant. He would not give the name of the person who told him, as he was only hearsay with his informant.

He declined to give the name of the person who told him, as he was only hearsay with his informant. He would not give the name of the person who told him, as he was only hearsay with his informant.

He declined to give the name of the person who told him, as he was only hearsay with his informant. He would not give the name of the person who told him, as he was only hearsay with his informant.

He declined to give the name of the person who told him, as he was only hearsay with his informant. He would not give the name of the person who told him, as he was only hearsay with his informant.

He declined to give the name of the person who told him, as he was only hearsay with his informant. He would not give the name of the person who told him, as he was only hearsay with his informant.

He declined to give the name of the person who told him, as he was only hearsay with his informant. He would not give the name of the person who told him, as he was only hearsay with his informant.

He declined to give the name of the person who told him, as he was only hearsay with his informant. He would not give the name of the person who told him, as he was only hearsay with his informant.

He declined to give the name of the person who told him, as he was only hearsay with his informant. He would not give the name of the person who told him, as he was only hearsay with his informant.

He declined to give the name of the person who told him, as he was only hearsay with his informant. He would not give the name of the person who told him, as he was only hearsay with his informant.

He declined to give the name of the person who told him, as he was only hearsay with his informant. He would not give the name of the person who told him, as he was only hearsay with his informant.

He declined to give the name of the person who told him, as he was only hearsay with his informant. He would not give the name of the person who told him, as he was only hearsay with his informant.

He declined to give the name of the person who told him, as he was only hearsay with his informant. He would not give the name of the person who told him, as he was only hearsay with his informant.

He declined to give the name of the person who told him, as he was only hearsay with his informant. He would not give the name of the person who told him, as he was only hearsay with his informant.

He declined to give the name of the person who told him, as he was only hearsay with his informant. He would not give the name of the person who told him, as he was only hearsay with his informant.

He declined to give the name of the person who told him, as he was only hearsay with his informant. He would not give the name of the person who told him, as he was only hearsay with his informant.

He declined to give the name of the person who told him, as he was only hearsay with his informant. He would not give the name of the person who told him, as he was only hearsay with his informant.

He declined to give the name of the person who told him, as he was only hearsay with his informant. He would not give the name of the person who told him, as he was only hearsay with his informant.

He declined to give the name of the person who told him, as he was only hearsay with his informant. He would not give the name of the person who told him, as he was only hearsay with his informant.

He declined to give the name of the person who told him, as he was only hearsay with his informant. He would not give the name of the person who told him, as he was only hearsay with his informant.

He declined to give the name of the person who told him, as he was only hearsay with his informant. He would not give the name of the person who told him, as he was only hearsay with his informant.

He declined to give the name of the person who told him, as he was only hearsay with his informant. He would not give the name of the person who told him, as he was only hearsay with his informant.

He declined to give the name of the person who told him, as he was only hearsay with his informant. He would not give the name of the person who told him, as he was only hearsay with his informant.

He declined to give the name of the person who told him, as he was only hearsay with his informant. He would not give the name of the person who told him, as he was only hearsay with his informant.

He declined to give the name of the person who told him, as he was only hearsay with his informant. He would not give the name of the person who told him, as he was only hearsay with his informant.

He declined to give the name of the person who told him, as he was only hearsay with his informant. He would not give the name of the person who told him, as he was only hearsay with his informant.

He declined to give the name of the person who told him, as he was only hearsay with his informant. He would not give the name of the person who told him, as he was only hearsay with his informant.

He declined to give the name of the person who told him, as he was only hearsay with his informant. He would not give the name of the person who told him, as he was only hearsay with his informant.

He declined to give the name of the person who told him, as he was only hearsay with his informant. He would not give the name of the person who told him, as he was only hearsay with his informant.

He declined to give the name of the person who told him, as he was only hearsay with his informant. He would not give the name of the person who told him, as he was only hearsay with his informant.

He declined to give the name of the person who told him, as he was only hearsay with his informant. He would not give the name of the person who told him, as he was only hearsay with his informant.

He declined to give the name of the person who told him, as he was only hearsay with his informant. He would not give the name of the person who told him, as he was only hearsay with his informant.

He declined to give the name of the person who told him, as he was only hearsay with his informant. He would not give the name of the person who told him, as he was only hearsay with his informant.

He declined to give the name of the person who told him, as he was only hearsay with his informant. He would not give the name of the person who told him, as he was only hearsay with his informant.

He declined to give the name of the person who told him, as he was only hearsay with his informant. He would not give the name of the person who told him, as he was only hearsay with his informant.

He declined to give the name of the person who told him, as he was only hearsay with his informant. He would not give the name of the person who told him, as he was only hearsay with his informant.

He declined to give the name of the person who told him, as he was only hearsay with his informant. He would not give the name of the person who told him, as he was only hearsay with his informant.

## SPRINGER INVESTIGATION.

The Testimony of the Same General Character to That Already Given—Will Close in Another Week.

CINCINNATI, Jan. 10.—The testimony before the Springer investigation committee this morning was of the same general character that has been already given. Edgar M. Johnson, law partner of Governor Hoadly, testified to the scenes in the United States Court-room similar to that mentioned by other witnesses. He was impatient upon seeing in the United States Court's office a cartoon of Cleveland as a hangman, and demanded its removal.

Mr. Bush, of Winchester, Ky., told of crowds of strangers in the city and about the polls.

Mr. T. Fain, artist, went to the United States Court-room, and visited some polling places. He witnessed a riot, and was expecting to make sketches for an Eastern publication, but no sketches were ordered.

Mr. Caldwell, Smoke Inspector, testified to having seen an unusual number of strange negroes in the city several days prior to the October election. The number was remarkable, and he saw the streets apparently having a list of names of the colored men, and saw prominent Republicans talking with colored men. He was not afraid to vote, but his family urged him not to go to the polls. A few Deputy Marshals holding Republican tickets. On cross-examination he said, I knew there was a colored Old Fellows' Convention here at the time.

Folkman testified to interference by a colored Deputy Marshal with him while in the election. He saw the Deputy Marshal, Mr. Sullivan, and two others come there in a hack, and heard them say something to the effect: "The sooner this—of a—gets out of the way the better."

The other witnesses examined were James McFarland, watchman on the suspension bridge, Michael Bolan and Patrick Bolan, policemen of Covington, R. E. Thorpe, Deputy Marshal on duty in the Twenty-fifth Ward, Mr. Faulkner, of Indiana, and J. Murphy, of Cincinnati.

Mears and the two Bolans said they saw many negroes passing the bridge into Cincinnati the night before the election.

Mr. Faulkner described the shooting scene in the Eighth Ward.

Thorpe said a negro arrested for illegal voting. He had voted the Democratic ticket.

Murphy described how he was knocked down and shot in the Fourth Ward.

Mr. Follett said he thought he could end his testimony in two more days.

Chairman Springer said he would probably close the investigation next Saturday.

Weekly Bank Statement.

New York, Jan. 10.—The following is the bank statement for the week ending to-day:

Loans..... \$1,734,000  
Specie..... \$7,309,000  
Legal tenders..... 4,420,000  
Deposits..... 8,431,000  
Circulation..... 7,625,000  
Reserves..... 132,000

The banks now hold \$47,444,000 in excess of legal requirements.

Mary Anderson Will Build a Theater in London.

LONDON, Jan. 10.—The agents of Mary Anderson are seeking ground, near the Strand, upon which to build a theater. They made an offer to the proprietors to take the playhouse, and agreed to make a deposit of \$50,000, and a year's rent of \$2,000. The proprietors wanted in addition power to veto productions. The negotiations are now on.

How to cure a severe case of chills and fever for fifty cents.—Buy a box of Victoria Pills; they are safe, sure and agreeable to take.

S. L. Warner, Undertaker, Embalmer and Taxidermist, 49 West Maryland street, Indianapolis.

TUTT'S PILLS

"THE OLD RELIABLE."

25 YEARS IN USE.

The Greatest Medical Triumph of the Age!

Indorsed all over the World.

SYMPTOMS OF A TORPID LIVER.

Loss of appetite, Nausea, bowels constipated, Pain in the Head with a dull sensation in the back part, Pain under the shoulder blade, fullness after eating, with a disclination, exertion of body or mind, Irritability of temper, Low spirits, Loss of memory, with a feeling of having neglected some duty, weariness, Dizziness, Fluttering of the Heart, Dots before the eyes, Yellow Skin, Headache, Restlessness at night, highly colored urine.

IF THESE WARNINGS ARE UNDEEDED, SERIOUS DISEASES WILL SOON BE DEVELOPED.